

## (1) exercise its Plenary Powers to rule:

- (a) that the name *Pterodactylus crassipes* Meyer, 1857 is not to be given priority over the name *Archaeopteryx lithographica* Meyer, 1861, by any zoologist who believes that those names apply to the same species-group taxon;
- (b) that the type-specimen of *Archaeopteryx lithographica* Meyer, 1861, is the species whose fossil skeletal remains, imbedded in Solenhofen limestone, Kimmeridgian, are in the British Museum (Natural History), bearing catalogue No. 37001.

COMMENT ON *SCHISTODERA* COBB, 1920 (NEMATODA:  
ENOPLIDA), A REQUEST FOR SUPPRESSION; *OXYSTOMINA*  
FILIPJEV, 1921 PROPOSED FOR THE OFFICIAL LIST. Z.N.(S.) 2031  
(See volume 30, pages 102-103)

By R. V. Melville (*Secretary, International Commission on  
Zoological Nomenclature*)

The generic name *Oxystomina* first appears in the legend on Plate 2 of Filipjev's two part presentation. The plates are bound after the first 22 sheets of Part 1, 1918 and before sheets 23-39 of Part 2, 1921. We are grateful to Dr. Bruce E. Hopper of the Plant Protection Division, Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, Canada, for bringing this fact to our attention.

Bound in front of the title page is a note printed in Russian, which translates as: "After the binding, the title page and the foreword of the first part have been discarded, the rest follows as:

1. Title page, foreword and the table of contents (from part I)
2. Sheets 1-22 (from part I)
3. Sheets 23-39 (from part II)
4. Plates 1-11 (from part I)".

Then, on page iv of the foreword is a list of the publication dates of the separate sheets. This is translated as follows:

1 — April 1916	19 — September 1917
2- 4 — May 1916	20-22 — March 1918
5- 9 — September 1916	23-24 — March 1918
10-11 — January 1917	25-26 — July 1918
12-13 — April 1917	27 — December 1918
14 — February 1917	28-32 — October 1921
15-17 — April 1917	33-39 — December 1921
18 — February 1918	

This list is followed by this sentence: "The first part (sheets 1-22) appeared in November 1918, the second is appearing now". (This foreword was written by I. N. Filipjev and is dated Petrograd, 1 December 1921).

Thus, the date of publication of *Oxystomina* is 1918 and not 1921 as given in the application, and *Oxystomina* is an available name from 1918. (Article 12; 16(a) (vii)). On plate 2, *Oxystomina clavicauda* n.sp. and *Oxystomina filiformis* n.sp. are both named and figured and therefore, one of these two species should be designated as the type-species for *Oxystomina* (Article 69(a)). In order that *Oxystoma elongatum* Bütschli, 1874, may be designated as the type-species, the plenary powers must be invoked.

Therefore the proposals put forward by W. D. Hope and D. G. Murphy are here amended and the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type-species for the nominal genus *Oxystomina* Filipjev, 1918, made prior to the requested Ruling and,

having done so, to designate *Oxystoma elongatum* Bütschli, 1874, to be the type-species of that genus;

(2) to place the generic name *Oxystomina* Filipjev, 1918 (gender: feminine), type-species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Oxystoma elongatum* Bütschli, 1874, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *elongatum* Bütschli, 1874, as published in the binomen *Oxystoma elongatum* (type-species of *Oxystomina* Filipjev, 1918) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

#### COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES FOR *CERITHIUM* BRUGUIÈRE [1789]. Z.N.(S.) 2032

By Walter O. Cernohorsky (Auckland Institute and Museum, Auckland, N.Z.)

Houbrick (1973, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 30 : 104-107) requested the Commission to suppress previous type-species designation for *Cerithium* Bruguière [1789] and to designate *C. adansonii* Bruguière, 1792, as the type-species of *Cerithium*.

The type-species of *Cerithium* has been a source of confusion for many years and Dr. Houbrick's petition for the designation of *C. adansonii* as the type-species of *Cerithium* will solve taxonomic problems and is therefore strongly supported. However, is Montfort's type designation (1810, *Conch. Syst.*, 2 : 511) of *C. virgatum* Montfort, 1810, as the type-species of *Cerithium* Bruguière [1789] really valid? Bruguière (1792, *Encycl. méth. vers.*, 1 : 467-501) does not actually cite a *C. virgatum* by name, either as a valid species or as a synonym. While all of Bruguière's species subsequently referred to the genus *Cerithium* are all equally eligible for type selection, *C. virgatum* was not among these originally included species (Art. 69(a)(i) of the Code). There may have been a type designation by Montfort by inference due to the inclusion of *Murex vertagus* Linnaeus, in the synonymy of *Cerithium virgatum* Montfort, but the Code does not provide for this kind of type-species designation.

Schumacher (1817, *Essai nouv. syst.*, pp. 223, 227) did not select any type-species at all. On p. 223 he lists *Cerithium* which he properly credits to Bruguière and not Lamarck, and on the following page includes in the genus-group the species *C. palustre*, *C. nodulosum* and *C. aluco* without selecting a type-species. The second group referred to by Dr. Houbrick is the genus *Vertagus* Schumacher, 1817 (non Link, 1807) which appeared on p. 227 and includes the species *V. vulgaris* and *V. granularis*, without a formal designation of a type-species.

#### COMMENT ON THE PROPOSAL TO PLACE *LEUCOSPIS GIGAS* FABRICIUS, 1793 ON THE OFFICIAL LIST OF SPECIFIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY. Z.N.(S.) 2038

By B. D. Burks (Systematic Entomology Laboratory, U.S. Department  
of Agriculture, c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington D.C. 20560)

I am in favour of the action to place *Leucospis gigas* Fabricius, 1793, on the Official List. The specific name should be preserved, because it is widely used in zoological literature in the fields of biology, taxonomy, and faunistics. Dalla Torre, *Catalogus Hymenopterorum* volume 5, 1898, includes 26 references to papers about *gigas*. In addition, the literature files in the U.S. National Museum include references to 29 papers on *gigas* that were published after 1898. This total does not include papers that are essentially faunal lists. Examples of two of the latter are Breland, 1940, *Faune de la France VII, Hyménoptères*, where he states (in French) "*Leucospis* F. . . . 5 species in France, the most common being *L. gigas*" or Bouček, 1957, *Klic Zvireny CSR*, II, p. 208, where he states (in Czech) that *gigas* was taken "near Bratislava".

I have never been in favour of the strict application of the rule of priority when it would entail the suppression of a name that has been widely used in non-taxonomic literature. *Leucospis gigas* is one such.